

## REMARKS

The Rule 312 Amendment filed October 15, 2004 sought to correct identical typographical errors in claims 5 and 7, to change "video input data" to "input video data"—and thereby to be consistent with that same latter expression appearing later in each of the claims.

The change in claim 7 was approved.

The change in claim 5 was denied because not maintaining antecedent support for the expression "video input data" in claim 6/5.

Applicant concedes that the inconsistent expression of claim 6/5 was inadvertently overlooked and, accordingly, as a part of this request for reconsideration have presented a currently amended claim 6 in which the same change is made as in claims 5 and 7, to establish the identical phrase "input video data"—at two locations in claim 5 (just as were established in claim 7) and likewise, in claim 6/5, so that claim 5 provides consistent antecedent support exists for that phrase (corrected) in claim 6/5.

Applicants' undersigned counsel discussed the submission of this Request for Reconsideration with Examiner Alphonse on January 27, 2005, who indicated that this request would receive favorable consideration by him, which Applicant greatly appreciates.

No new matter is presented and, accordingly, approval and entry of the amended claims 5 and 6 are respectfully requested.

It is also noted that the amendments to claims 5 and 6 render same consistent not only with claim 7 but also claim 1.

The need for these above changes were first recognized when reviewing the allowed claims following receipt of the Notice of Allowance as to claim 5 and when receiving the response to Rule 312 communication mailed January 24, 2005, as to claim 6 and accordingly the changes could not have been presented earlier.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: January 27, 2005

By: 

H. J. Staas  
Registration No. 22,010

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501